



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,779	06/06/2005	Kailash Gopalakrishnan	STFD.035US	6609
40581	7590	09/12/2008	EXAMINER	
CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC 1150 NORTHLAND DRIVE, SUITE 100 ST. PAUL, MN 55120			SALERNO, SARAH KATE	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2814				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/518,779	GOPALAKRISHNAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SARAH K. SALERNO	2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-39 and 43 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-39 and 43 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment/arguments filed on 06/26/08 as being acknowledged and entered. By this amendment claims 40-42 are canceled, no new claims have been added, claims 1-39 & 43 are pending and no claims are withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-39 & 43 in the Non-Final office action dated 03/26/08 are withdrawn based on applicants amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-20, 39 & 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sin et al. (US Patent 5,869,847).

Claim 1: Sin teaches a semiconductor device, comprising: a multi-region body including a first region dominated by charge carriers of a first polarity that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by charge carriers of a second polarity, opposite the first polarity, that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having an effective length extending from the first junction to the second junction; and a gate capacitively-coupled to the body and adapted for using a control signal, when the body is reversed biased, to modulate the effective length of the intermediate region by

changing a concentration of carriers in the intermediate region to a nonzero value (Fig 1b, Col. 6-8).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of effective length modulation when the body is reversed bias, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 2: Sin teaches the gate is further adapted to cause the device to transition between a current-conducting state in which the device is in an avalanche breakdown condition and a current-blocking state. In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 2 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 3: Sin teaches means for modulating an electric field within the body to cause the device to transition between a current- conducting state in which the device is in avalanche breakdown condition and a current-blocking state (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 3

because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 4: Sin teaches a relatively high bias voltage at the gate maintains the device in a current-conducting state in which the device is in an avalanche breakdown condition, and wherein a relatively low bias voltage at the gate maintains the device in a current-blocking state (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 4 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 5: Sin teaches the relatively high bias voltage shortens the effective length of the intermediate region (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 5 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 6: Sin teaches a relatively low bias voltage at the gate maintains the device in a current-conducting state in which the device is in an avalanche breakdown condition, and a relatively-high bias voltage at the gate maintains the device in a current-blocking state (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 6 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 7: Sin teaches the relatively low bias voltage shortens the effective length of the intermediate region (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 2 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 9: Sin teaches the gate is located at least predominantly over the intermediate region (FIG. 1b).

Claim 10: Sin teaches the gate is located to provide a surface channel nearer the second junction than the first junction (FIG. 1b; Col. 2-3).

Claim 11: Sin teaches wherein when the body is reversed-biased, the first region is maintained at a relatively lower voltage level than the second region, the difference in potential of the first and second regions being sufficient to cause a breakdown condition in the intermediate region in response to the control signal modulating the length of the intermediate region and thereby reducing the distance across the intermediate region over which the potential drops (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 11 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 12: Sin teaches the intermediate region has a polarity that is neutral relative to the polarity of the first and second regions (FIG. 1b).

Claim 14: Sin teaches the intermediate region is substantially intrinsic (FIG. 1b).

Claim 15: Sin teaches the gate is further adapted to cause the device to transition between a current-conducting state in which the device is in an avalanche breakdown condition and a current-blocking state in which substantially no leakage current passes between the first and second regions (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 15

because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 16: Sin teaches a controller coupled to the gate and adapted for applying the control signal to change the concentration of carriers in the intermediate region (Col. 2-3).

Claim 17: Sin teaches the gate is further adapted to increase an electric field in the intermediate region and for causing an avalanche breakdown condition (Col. 2-3).

Claim 18: Sin teaches a semiconductor device comprising: a multi-region body including a P-type region, an N-type region and an intermediate region having a first junction with the P-type region and a second junction with the N-type region, the body adapted to be reverse biased across the P-type and N-type regions; a gate coupled via an intervening gate dielectric material to the intermediate region, and offset to present an electric field substantially at only one of the two junctions; and the gate, the P-type region and the N-type region being adapted and controllable to switch the device between at least two stable conductance states in response to a voltage-bias control signal applied to the gate (Fig. 1b, Col. 2-3).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts

teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of switching between two stable conductance states in response to a voltage-bias control signal, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 19: Sin teaches the device is switched between a high-resistance conductance state and a low-resistance conductance state as a function of an avalanche breakdown condition at a field-induced junction in the intermediate region (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 19 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 20: Sin teaches the intermediate region has a length that separates the first and second junctions sufficiently to permit the avalanche breakdown condition before another breakdown condition when the body is reverse biased (Col. 2-3). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of claim 20 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 39: Sin teaches a semiconductor device, comprising: a multi-region body including a first region dominated by charge carriers of a first polarity that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by charge carriers of a second polarity opposite the first polarity that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region

having an effective length extending from the first junction to the second junction; and means for presenting, when the body is reversed biased, an electric field at the first junction, the body responding to the electric field by switching from a stable conductance state to a current-conducting state in which the body is in an avalanche breakdown condition and current passes in the body (Fig. 1b, Col. 2-3).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of switching between two stable conductance states in response to an electric field, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 43: Sin teaches a semiconductor device, comprising: a multi-region body having an upper surface and including a first region dominated by carriers of a first polarity that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by carriers of an opposite polarity that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having an upper portion over a lower portion and a length extending from the first junction to

the second junction; a gate capacitively-coupled to the body and adapted for using a control signal, when the body is reversed biased, to modulate the length of the intermediate region by changing a concentration of carriers in the intermediate region and thereby causing the device to transition between a current-conducting state in which the device is in an avalanche breakdown condition and a current-blocking state; and the avalanche breakdown condition occurring in the lower portion of the intermediate region, the upper portion of the intermediate region arranged to inhibit hot carriers from the lower portion reaching the upper surface in a current-conducting state (Fig. 1b, Col. 2-3).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Sin would inherently have the property of switching between two stable conductance states in response to a control signal and experiencing the avalanche breakdown conditions in the lower and upper portions of the intermediate region, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

4. Claims 8 & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sin et al. (US Patent 5,869,847) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Baba (US Patent 5,589,696).

Regarding claim 8, as described above, Sin substantially reads on the invention as claimed, except Sin does not teach the gate is located at least predominantly over the second region. Baba teaches the gate (21) is located at least predominantly over the second region (FIG. 2) to be more highly integrated (Col. 4 lines 1-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device taught by Sin to have the gate located predominantly over the second region to be more highly integrated as taught by Baba (Col. 4 lines 1-20)

Claim 13: Baba teaches the intermediate region (11) is lightly doped to achieve the polarization of one of the first and second regions, the intermediate region having a substantially lower dopant concentration level, relative to said one of the first and second regions (FIG. 2).

5. Claims 21-38, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over et al. Koga (US Patent 5,936,265).

Claim 21: Koga teaches a memory circuit comprising: a data storage node; a multi-region body including a first region dominated by charge carriers of a first polarity that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by charge carriers having a

second and opposite polarity that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having an effective length extending from the first junction to the second junction; and a gate coupled to the body via an intervening dielectric material and offset for using a control signal, when the body is reversed biased, to present an electric field substantially at only one of the first and second junctions, the body responding to the electric field by switching from a stable conductance state to a current-conducting state in which the body is in an avalanche breakdown condition and current passes between the data storage node and the body (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of switching between two stable conductance states in response to a voltage-bias control signal, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 22: Koga teaches the body and the gate are adapted to access data stored at the data storage node as a function of the avalanche breakdown condition

(FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).. In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 22 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 23: Koga teaches the body and the gate are adapted to read data from the data storage node as a function of the avalanche breakdown condition (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 23 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 24: Koga teaches the body and the gate are adapted to write data to the data storage node as a function of the avalanche breakdown condition (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 24 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 25: Koga teaches a charge at the data storage node is maintained by controlling the body in a reverse biased condition (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 25 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 26: Koga teaches the body and the storage nodes are adapted to drain a charge at the storage node in response to the body being placed in a forward biased condition (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught

by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 26 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 27: Koga teaches a memory circuit comprising: a data storage node; a multi-region body including a first region dominated by charge carriers having a first polarization that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by charge carriers having a second polarity that is opposite the first polarity that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having an effective length extending from the first junction to the second junction; and a gate coupled to the body via an intervening dielectric material and offset for using a control signal, when the body is reversed biased, to present an electric field substantially at only one of the first and second junctions, the body responding to the electric field by switching from a stable conductance state to a current-conducting state in which the body is in an avalanche breakdown condition and current passes through the body as a function of a charge at the data storage node (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this

case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of switching between two stable conductance states in response to a voltage-bias control signal, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 28: Koga teaches the data storage node is coupled to the gate, the gate responding to a charge at the data storage node by presenting the electric field (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).

Claim 29: Koga teaches a sense device coupled to the body and adapted to detect data stored at the data storage node in response to current passing through the body (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).

Claim 30: Koga teaches a memory circuit comprising: a data storage node; first and second multi-region bodies, each body including a first region dominated by charge carriers of a first polarity that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by charge carriers of a second polarity opposite the first polarity that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having an effective length extending from the first junction to the second junction; a first gate coupled to the first body via an intervening dielectric material and offset for using a control signal, when the first body is reversed biased, to present an electric field substantially at only one of the first and second junctions of the first body, the first body responding to the electric field by switching from a stable conductance state to a current-conducting state in which the first body is in an avalanche breakdown condition and current passes between the data storage node and the first body; and a second gate coupled to the data storage node and to the second

body via an intervening dielectric material and adapted for using a charge at the data storage node, when the second body is reversed biased, to modulate an electric field in the intermediate region of the second body, the second body responding to the electric field by switching from a stable conductance state to a current-conducting state in which the second body is in an avalanche breakdown condition and current passes through the second body (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of switching between two stable conductance states in response to a control signal, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 31: Koga teaches a sense device coupled to the second body and adapted to detect data as a function of sensed current passing through the second body, and wherein the second gate is further adapted to influence an electric field substantially at only one of the first and second junctions (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-

23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 31 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 32: Koga teaches a semiconductor device, comprising: a multi-region body including a first region dominated by charge carriers of a first polarity that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by charge carriers of a second polarity opposite the first polarity that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having an effective length extending from the first junction to the second junction; and first and second gates coupled to the body via intervening dielectric material and adapted for using control signals, when the body is reversed biased, to present an electric field at one of the first and second junctions, the body responding to the electric field by switching from a stable conductance state to a current-conducting state in which the body is in an avalanche breakdown condition (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of

switching between two stable conductance states in response to a control signal, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 33: Koga teaches the first gate is adapted to capacitively couple a first voltage-bias control signal to the body to accumulate carriers immediately adjacent to said one of the first and second junctions, the body being held in a steady state without the avalanche breakdown condition occurring absent a similarly-biased control signal capacitively coupled to the body from the second gate (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 33 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 34: Koga teaches the first gate is adapted to capacitively couple a first voltage-bias control signal to the body to accumulate carriers immediately adjacent to said one of the first and second junctions, the body switching to the current-conducting state in response to a second voltage-bias control signal being capacitively coupled to the body, the first and second voltage-bias control signals being of similar bias (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 34 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 35: Koga teaches the second gate is responsive to temperature and adapted to apply a control signal to the body that counters temperature-related effects that alter the creation of the avalanche breakdown condition in response to a control

signal being applied by the first gate (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 35 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 36: Koga teaches the second gate is adapted to apply the control signal to maintain a threshold voltage level in the intermediate region, the threshold voltage being a minimum amount of additional voltage applied to the intermediate region for causing the avalanche breakdown condition (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of claim 36 because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 37: Koga teaches an inverter circuit comprising: first and second multi-region bodies, each body having a highly-doped P-type region that extends to a first junction, a highly-doped N-type region that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having a neutral polarity relative to the P- type and N-type regions and having a length extending from the first junction to the second junction, the N-type region of the first body and the P-type region of the second body being coupled to a common output node; first and second gates respectively capacitively coupled to the first and second bodies and each adapted, when the bodies are reversed biased, to modulate the length of the intermediate regions of the respective bodies by changing a concentration of carriers in the respective intermediate regions; and an input node coupled to the first and second gates, wherein a change in input signal applied to the

input nodes causes an inverted response in an output signal at the output node (FIG. 18a-c; 45 Col. 15-16, 22-23).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of modulating the length of the intermediate regions under reversed bias conditions and a change in input signal causing an inverted response in an output signal, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Claim 38: Koga teaches a semiconductor device comprising: a relatively thin intermediate region defined by sides including an upper portion and a sidewall portion; a first region dominated by a first polarization that extends to a first junction with the intermediate region; a second region dominated by a second polarization that extends to a second junction with the intermediate region; and a gate extending around and capacitively coupled to at least two sides of the intermediate region for coupling a voltage to the intermediate region, when the first and second regions are reversed biased, to present an electric field substantially at only one of the first and second

junctions, the device responding to the electric field by switching from a stable conductance state to a current-conducting state in which the body is in an avalanche breakdown condition and current passes through the intermediate region (FIG. 18a-c; Col. 15-16, 22-23).

It is noted that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It has also been held that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior arts teach the identical chemical structure the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case the semiconductor device taught by Koga would inherently have the property of switching between two stable conductance states in response to a electric field, because the semiconductor device is structurally identical to the claimed semiconductor device.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39 & 43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARAH K. SALERNO whose telephone number is (571)270-1266. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. K. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2814

/Theresa T. Doan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814